UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/065,268	09/30/2002	Akira Ohmura		5678

25944 7590 06/05/2006

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. BOX 19928
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320

EXAMINER	
HERNANDEZ, NELSON D	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2622	

DATE MAILED: 06/05/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/065,268	OHMURA, AKIRA	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Nelson D. Hernandez	2622	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *27 March 2006*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-5 and 7-18* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-5 and 7-18* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *27 March 2006* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *1/31/2006*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. The Examiner acknowledges the amended claims filed on March 27, 2006. Claims 1, 7-9 and 18 have been amended. Claim 6 has been canceled.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed March 27, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The Applicant argues the following:

a. "Neither Sarbadhikari et al. nor Berstis discloses or suggests the combinations of features recited in independent claims 1, 9 and 10, in which a digital camera coupled to a docking station transmits only the digital data of images, but not other digital data, from the memory of the digital camera to a digital image storage (as recited in independent claims 1 and 9) or to the storage medium of an image storage (as recited in independent claim 10)" and that "Applicant respectfully traverses the Office Action's assertion that Sarbadhikari et al. discloses that "Sarbadhikari et al. explicitly discloses that when the memory card is coupled to the computer, the computer checks to see if there are any software enhancements stored on the memory card 24 "which can be used by the computer" and then "if the card does contain appropriate 'software enhancements', however, these are downloaded from the card (the memory card

24) to the RAM instruction memory 9a (of the computer)..." See col. 8, lines 6-17 of Sarbadhikari et al. As described at col. 8, lines 36-39, this process "eliminates the need for a separate means of supplying the code (to the computer), such as the floppy disk." Also see col. 4, lines 20-23, which discusses the prior art practice of providing software updates to the computer via a separate floppy disk. Sarbadhikari et al. thus discloses the opposite of what Applicant is claiming in this application. That is, Sarbadhikari et al. discloses that "enhancement data files" (which can be non-image files) existing in the memory card 24 are transmitted to the computer; Sarbadhikari et al. does not disclose or suggest an arrangement in which "only the digital data of the images, but not the other digital data, from the memory of the digital camera" is transmitted to the image storage."

➢ The Examiner respectfully disagrees, the Examiner acknowledges that Sarbadhikari et al. teaches that when the memory card is coupled to the computer, the computer checks to see if there are any software enhancements stored on the memory card 24 "which can be used by the computer" and then "if the card does contain appropriate 'software enhancements', however, these are downloaded from the card (the memory card 24) to the RAM instruction memory 9a (of the computer)..." See col. 8, lines 6-17 of Sarbadhikari et al. The claim as written requires "a controller that causes the digital camera to transmit only the digital data of the images, but not the other data, from the memory of the digital camera to the digital image storage" and by teaching that the "when the memory card is coupled to the computer, the computer checks to see if there are any

software enhancements stored on the memory card 24 "which can be used by the computer" and then "if the card does contain appropriate 'software enhancements', however, these are downloaded from the card (the memory card 24) to the RAM instruction memory 9a (of the computer)..." (See col. 8, lines 6-24), Sarbadhikari et al. inherently disclose that when the software enhancements stored in the memory are not needed by the computer, said computer would only cause the digital camera to transfer only the digital data of the images, but not the other data (software enhancements), from the memory of the digital camera to the digital image storage.

b. "Berstis also does not disclose or suggest an arrangement in which only the digital data of images, but not other digital data, present in the memory of a digital camera is transmitted to an image storage while the digital camera is coupled to the image storage via a docking station. Rather, Berstis discloses that image data and text data existing in the digital camera are transferred to the external computer. See, for example, col. 4, lines 53-60 of Berstis".

➢ The Examiner acknowledges that the Berstis does not disclose or suggest an arrangement in which only the digital data of images, but not other digital data, present in the memory of a digital camera is transmitted to an image storage while the digital camera is coupled to the image storage via a docking station, the Berstis' reference is presented to teach the limitation "the connector includes a docking station for coupling with the digital camera.

Therefore, rejections made to claims 1, 9, 10 are maintained.

3. Claims 1, 7-10 and 14-18 ar r jected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sarbadhikari, 5,477,264 in view of Berstis, US Patent 6,721,001 B1.

Regarding claim 1, Sarbadhikari discloses a digital image storage (see computer in fig. 11: 4 comprising a disk drive 8) for use with a digital camera (Figs. 2 and 10) having a memory (Fig. 2: 24) capable of storing digital data of images and other digital data (enhancement files shown in fig. 2: 24b), the digital image storage comprising: a connector (interface cable shown in fig. 11: 38) for communicating with the digital camera; a controller (CPU shown in fig. 9b) that causes the digital camera to transmit only the digital data of the images, but not the other digital data, from the memory of the digital camera to the digital image storage while the digital camera is coupled to the connector (by teaching that when the memory card is coupled to the computer, the computer checks to see if there are any software enhancements stored on the memory card 24 "which can be used by the computer" and then "if the card does contain appropriate 'software enhancements', however, these are downloaded from the card (the memory card 24) to the RAM instruction memory 9a (of the computer)..." (See col. 8, lines 6-24), Sarbadhikari et al. inherently disclose that when the software enhancements stored in the memory are not needed by the computer, said computer would only cause the digital camera to transfer only the digital data of the images, but not the other data (software enhancements), from the memory of the digital camera to the digital image storage) (Col. 7, line 51 – col. 8, line 49; col. 11, lines 14-42).

Sarbadhikari fails to teach that the connector includes a docking station for coupling with the digital camera.

However, Berstis discloses a digital image storage system (See fig. 1) for use with a digital camera (Fig. 1: 102) having a memory (Fig. 2: 214), the digital image storage system comprising: a docking station (Fig. 1: 106) on which the digital camera is to be placed for taking out digital images stored in the memory of the digital camera; and a digital image storage (Personal computer; col. 2, lines 15-46) located apart from the docking station for communicating with the docking station, wherein the digital camera includes a controller (Fig. 2: 208) that detects a signal from the docking station and causes transmission of the digital images subsequent to receipt of the signal (Col. 2, line 15 - col. 3, line 8; col. 4, lines 5-63). Having the storage medium disposed in a housing separate from the housing having the docking station is advantageous because it would alleviate the need to use a cable to connect the camera to the host, as is done with other digital still cameras and which may require restarting the local host to recognize the newly connected camera, this would also improve the operability and reduce the time needed to connect a camera to a host.

Therefore, taking the combined teaching of Sarbadhikari in view of Berstis as a whole, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Sarbadhikari by having the digital images in the memory being transmitted from the memory to the digital image storage by way of a docking station and detecting said docking station in order to transmit the images to said digital image storage from said digital camera. The motivation to do so would have been to

alleviate the need to use a cable to connect the camera to the host, as is done with other digital still cameras and which may require restarting the local host to recognize the newly connected camera, this would also improve the operability and reduce the time needed to connect a camera to a host.

Regarding claim 7, the combined teaching of Sarbadhikari in view of Berstis teaches that the docking station charges a battery of the digital camera while the digital camera is coupled to the docking station (See Berstis, col. 2, lines 15-39).

Regarding claim 8, the combined teaching of Sarbadhikari in view of Berstis teaches that a signal that causes the controller to start the transmission of the digital data of the images is output from the docking station after the coupling of the digital camera with the docking station (See Berstis, col. 4, lines 35-63).

Regarding claim 9, Sarbadhikari discloses a storage medium that stores a computer program that is executable by a controller of a digital image storage (see computer in fig. 11: 4 comprising a disk drive 8) that can be used with a digital camera (Figs. 2 and 10) having a memory (Fig. 2: 24) capable of storing digital data of images and other digital data (enhancement files shown in fig. 2: 24b), the digital data of the images being transmitted from the digital camera memory to the digital image storage by way of a connector (interface cable shown in fig. 11: 38) capable of being coupled with the digital camera, the computer program product storing a program comprising instruction to cause the controller (CPU shown in fig. 9b) to perform the steps of: performing the transmission of the digital data of the images, but not the other digital data from the memory of the digital camera is coupled to the digital image storage

through the connector; and storing the transmitted digital data of the images in the digital image storage (by teaching that when the memory card is coupled to the computer, the computer checks to see if there are any software enhancements stored on the memory card 24 "which can be used by the computer" and then "if the card does contain appropriate 'software enhancements', however, these are downloaded from the card (the memory card 24) to the RAM instruction memory 9a (of the computer)..." (See col. 8, lines 6-24), Sarbadhikari et al. inherently disclose that when the software enhancements stored in the memory are not needed by the computer, said computer would only cause the digital camera to transfer only the digital data of the images, but not the other data (software enhancements), from the memory of the digital camera to the digital image storage) (Col. 7, line 51 – col. 8, line 49; col. 11, lines 14-42).

Sarbadhikari fails to teach a docking station and the step of detecting receipt of a signal from the docking station to initiate the transmission of the digital data memory of the digital camera to the digital image storage in response to the signal.

However, Berstis discloses a digital image storage system (See fig. 1) for use with a digital camera (Fig. 1: 102) having a memory (Fig. 2: 214), the digital image storage system comprising: a docking station (Fig. 1: 106) on which the digital camera is to be placed for taking out digital images stored in the memory of the digital camera; and a digital image storage (Personal computer; col. 2, lines 15-46) located apart from the docking station for communicating with the docking station, wherein the digital camera includes a controller (Fig. 2: 208) that detects a signal from the docking station and causes transmission of the digital images subsequent to receipt of the signal (Col.

2, line 15 - col. 3, line 8; col. 4, lines 5-63). Having the storage medium disposed in a housing separate from the housing having the docking station is advantageous because it would alleviate the need to use a cable to connect the camera to the host, as is done with other digital still cameras and which may require restarting the local host to recognize the newly connected camera, this would also improve the operability and reduce the time needed to connect a camera to a host.

Therefore, taking the combined teaching of Sarbadhikari in view of Berstis as a whole, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Sarbadhikari by having the digital images in the memory being transmitted from the memory to the digital image storage by way of a docking station and detecting said docking station in order to transmit the images to said digital image storage from said digital camera. The motivation to do so would have been to alleviate the need to use a cable to connect the camera to the host, as is done with other digital still cameras and which may require restarting the local host to recognize the newly connected camera, this would also improve the operability and reduce the time needed to connect a camera to a host.

Regarding claim 10, Sarbadhikari discloses a digital image storage system for use with a digital camera (Figs. 2 and 10) having a memory (Fig. 2: 24) capable of storing digital data of images and other digital data (enhancement files shown in fig. 2: 24b), the system comprising: an image storage (see computer in fig. 11: 4 comprising a disk drive 8) in communication with the digital camera, the image storage including a storage medium (disk drive 8), and a controller (CPU shown in fig. 9b) that causes the

transmission of digital data of the images, but not the other digital data through a connector (interface cable shown in fig. 11: 38) to the storage medium of the image storage while the digital camera is connected to the image storage (by teaching that when the memory card is coupled to the computer, the computer checks to see if there are any software enhancements stored on the memory card 24 "which can be used by the computer" and then "if the card does contain appropriate 'software enhancements', however, these are downloaded from the card (the memory card 24) to the RAM instruction memory 9a (of the computer)..." (See col. 8, lines 6-24), Sarbadhikari et al. inherently disclose that when the software enhancements stored in the memory are not needed by the computer, said computer would only cause the digital camera to transfer only the digital data of the images, but not the other data (software enhancements), from the memory of the digital camera to the digital image storage) (Col. 7, line 51 – col. 8, line 49; col. 11, lines 14-42).

Sarbadhikari fails to teach a docking station on which the digital camera can be placed to communicate with the digital camera; and that the controller causes the transmission of digital data of the digital camera through the docking station and to the storage medium of the image storage while the digital camera is placed on the docking station.

However, Berstis discloses a digital image storage system (See fig. 1) for use with a digital camera (Fig. 1: 102) having a memory (Fig. 2: 214), the digital image storage system comprising: a docking station (Fig. 1: 106) on which the digital camera is to be placed for taking out digital images stored in the memory of the digital camera;

and a digital image storage (Personal computer; col. 2, lines 15-46) located apart from the docking station for communicating with the docking station, wherein the digital camera includes a controller (Fig. 2: 208) that detects a signal from the docking station and causes transmission of the digital images subsequent to receipt of the signal (Col. 2, line 15 - col. 3, line 8; col. 4, lines 5-63). Having the storage medium disposed in a housing separate from the housing having the docking station is advantageous because it would alleviate the need to use a cable to connect the camera to the host, as is done with other digital still cameras and which may require restarting the local host to recognize the newly connected camera, this would also improve the operability and reduce the time needed to connect a camera to a host.

Therefore, taking the combined teaching of Sarbadhikari in view of Berstis as a whole, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Sarbadhikari by having the digital images in the memory being transmitted from the memory to the digital image storage by way of a docking station and detecting said docking station in order to transmit the images to said digital image storage from said digital camera. The motivation to do so would have been to alleviate the need to use a cable to connect the camera to the host, as is done with other digital still cameras and which may require restarting the local host to recognize the newly connected camera, this would also improve the operability and reduce the time needed to connect a camera to a host.

Regarding claim 14, the combined teaching of Sarbadhikari in view of Berstis teaches that the controller detects a signal that causes the controller to start the transmission of the digital data of the images (See Berstis, col. 4, lines 35-63).

Regarding claim 15, the combined teaching of Sarbadhikari in view of Berstis teaches that the docking station charges a battery of the digital camera while the digital camera is coupled to the docking station (See Berstis, col. 2, lines 15-39).

Regarding claim 16, the combined teaching of Sarbadhikari in view of Berstis teaches that a signal causes the controller to start the transmission of the digital data of the images is output from the docking station after the placement of the digital camera on the docking station (See Berstis, col. 4, lines 35-63).

Regarding claim 17, the combined teaching of Sarbadhikari in view of Berstis teaches that the docking station has a shape to fit a bottom of the digital camera (See fig. 1, docking station 106 has a shape to fit a bottom of the digital camera 102).

Regarding claim 18, the combined teaching of Sarbadhikari in view of Berstis teaches that the docking station has a shape to fit a bottom of the digital camera (See fig. 1, docking station 106 has a shape to fit a bottom of the digital camera 102).

4. Claims 2, 3, 5, 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sarbadhikari, 5,477,264 in view of Berstis, US Patent 6,721,001 B1 and further in view of Fichtner, 6,256,059 B1.

Regarding claim 2, the combined teaching of Sarbadhikari in view of Berstis fails to teach that the controller causes the digital camera to transmit the digital data of all the images in the memory to the digital image storage.

However, Fichtner teaches an imaging device (Fig. 1: 10) that is attachable to a host system (Fig. 1: 20) via a cable (Fig. 1: 22), wherein, when the imaging device is attached to the host system, said host system automatically request all the images stored in the imaging device or a particular image (Col. 1, line 66 – col. 2, line 3; col. 2, - lines 14-43 and line 63 – col. 3, line 6; col. 4, lines 17-26). Downloading the image data automatically from the imaging to the host system is advantageous because it frees the user from having to select the images to be transmitted in order to transfer said images to the host system, also it would speed up freeing memory space in the imaging device.

Therefore, taking the combined teaching of Sarbadhikari in view of Berstis and further in view of Fichtner as a whole, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Sarbadhikari and Berstis by transmitting the digital data of all the images in the memory to the digital image storage when the camera is connected to the storage device. The motivation to do so would have been to help freeing memory space in the digital camera and to reduce the number of operation steps by the user when transferring image data to the storage device.

Regarding claim 3, the combined teaching of Sarbadhikari in view of Berstis and further in view of Fichtner as applied to claim 2 teaches that the digital data of the images includes still images and motion picture images (See Fichtner, col. 1, lines 12-21).

Regarding claim 5, the combined teaching of Sarbadhikari in view of Berstis and further in view of Fichtner as applied to claim 2 teaches that the controller detects a

signal through the connector to cause the transmission of the digital data of the images (See Fichtner, col. 2, lines 30-43).

Regarding claim 11, the combined teaching of Sarbadhikari in view of Berstis fails to teach that the controller causes the digital camera to transmit the digital data of all the images in the memory to the image storage.

However, Fichtner teaches an imaging device (Fig. 1: 10) that is attachable to a host system (Fig. 1: 20) via a cable (Fig. 1: 22), wherein, when the imaging device is attached to the host system, said host system automatically request all the images stored in the imaging device or a particular image (Col. 1, line 66 – col. 2, line 3; col. 2, - lines 14-43 and line 63 – col. 3, line 6; col. 4, lines 17-26). Downloading the image data automatically from the imaging to the host system is advantageous because it frees the user from having to select the images to be transmitted in order to transfer said images to the host system, also it would speed up freeing memory space in the imaging device. Transmitting the digital data of all the images in the memory to the digital image storage when the camera is connected to the storage device is advantageous because it would help freeing memory space in the digital camera and to reduce the number of operation steps by the user when transferring image data to the storage device.

Therefore, taking the combined teaching of Sarbadhikari in view of Berstis and further in view of Fichtner as a whole, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the storage system in Sarbadhikari and Berstis by transmitting the digital data of all the images in the memory to the digital image storage when the camera is connected to the storage device. The

motivation to do so would have been to help freeing memory space in the digital camera and to reduce the number of operation steps by the user when transferring image data to the storage device.

Regarding claim 12, the combined teaching of Sarbadhikari in view of Berstis and further in view of Fichtner as applied to claim 11 teaches that the digital data of the images includes still images and motion picture images (See Fichtner, col. 1, lines 12-21).

5. Claims 4 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sarbadhikari, 5,477,264 in view of Berstis, US Patent 6,721,001 B1 and further in view of Davison, US Patent 6,516,099 B1.

Regarding claim 4, Sarbadhikari in view of Berstis fails to teach that the controller causes the transmission of the digital data of the images in order of the time when respective digital data of images were taken by the digital camera.

However, transferring images form a digital camera to an external device in the same order that said images were captured is notoriously well known in the art as taught by Davison wherein a camera (Fig. 1: 12) takes a plurality of images and a computer (Fig. 1: 12) downloads said images in the same order said images were taken in order to display the images in a display (Fig. 1: 18) in the same order the images were taken (Col. 7, lines 34-60). Taking out of the digital images in order of the time when respective digital images were taken by the digital camera is advantageous because it would help organizing the images when having a large amount of images

stored in the digital camera or the digital image storage, this would also help the user to better determine the age of the images.

Therefore, taking the combined teaching of Sarbadhikari in view of Berstis and further in view of Davison as a whole, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art a the time the invention was made to modify the digital image storage system in Sarbadhikari and Berstis by taking out of the digital images in order of the time when respective digital images were taken by the digital camera. The motivation to do so would have been to help the digital image storage organizing the images when having a large amount of images stored in the digital camera or the digital image storage, this would also help the user to better determine the age of the images.

Regarding claim 13, the combined teaching of Sarbadhikari in view of Berstis fails to teach that the controller causes the transmission of the digital data of the images in order of the time when respective digital data of images were taken by the digital camera.

However, transferring images form a digital camera to an external device in the same order that said images were captured is notoriously well known in the art as taught by Davison wherein a camera (Fig. 1: 12) takes a plurality of images and a computer (Fig. 1: 12) downloads said images in the same order said images were taken in order to display the images in a display (Fig. 1: 18) in the same order the images were taken (Col. 7, lines 34-60). Taking out of the digital images in order of the time when respective digital images were taken by the digital camera is advantageous because it would help organizing the images when having a large amount of images

stored in the digital camera or the digital image storage, this would also help the user to better determine the age of the images.

Therefore, taking the combined teaching of Sarbadhikari in view of Berstis and further in view of Davison as a whole, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art a the time the invention was made to modify the digital image storage system in Sarbadhikari and Berstis by taking out of the digital images in order of the time when respective digital images were taken by the digital camera. The motivation to do so would have been to help the digital image storage organizing the images when having a large amount of images stored in the digital camera or the digital image storage, this would also help the user to better determine the age of the images.

Conclusion

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Contact

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nelson D. Hernandez whose telephone number is (571) 272-7311. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 A.M. to 6:00 P.M..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Ometz can be reached on (571) 272-7593. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Nelson D. Hernandez
Examiner
Art Unit 2622

NDHH
May 30, 2006

TUAN HO
PRIMARY EXAMINER